ECTE250 Deliverable 1 Guidelines



**ECTE250 Deliverable 1 Proposal Presentation Guidelines**

During Winter-W3 Lecture each team have 13 minutes to present at least 2 and at most 3 proposals for the ECTE250 project. The 13 minutes are allocated as it follows: 10 minutes for presentation, 3 minutes for Q&A (question and answers). Presentation file must be submitted on Moodle by one team member by 8:00 pm, on the same day as the presentation.

All team members should present. All team members must attend and actively participate to the Q&A. A Peer Evaluation form must be completed by each team member by 8:00 pm, on the next day.

Presented project must be feasible within the allocated timeframe (11 Weeks in Winter and 11 Weeks in Spring) and budget for parts (900 AED), must be aligned with the ECTE250 theme, requirements and constraints as detailed in the detailed in the Project Introduction available on Moodle and in the Project Booklet.

The presentation of each project should include:

• Overall description of the project and key functionalities (functional requirements).

• Justification on how the proposed system aligns with the theme.

• Preliminary design (block diagrams, flowcharts, state charts, etc.).

• Justification on how the proposed system aligns with project requirements and constraints.

• Estimated prototyping (parts) and labour cost (spent so far, and estimate until completion).

• Prospective market and impact.

The panel will evaluate the proposals and then select one proposal for the team to then work on. Students are awarded with an individual (for deliverable 1, this is worth 1.5 % of ECTE250 final mark) and group mark (distributed using PE and worth 5% of ECTE250 final mark) for the presentation.

Individual marking criteria includes:

• Oral delivery (fluency, clarity, audible).

• Presentation delivery style (independent of notes or slides, i.e. do not read).

• Engagement with audience (i.e. contents presented interestingly).

Group marking criteria includes:

• Structure – presentation flow, timing, inclusion of introduction, main body and conclusion.

• Visual Aids – appropriate use of diagrams and illustrations.

• Questions – ability to answer questions clearly and concisely by all team members.

• Content – relevancy of the contents:

o System description and functionalities.

o Preliminary design.

o Alignment with theme and technical requirements/constraints.

o Estimated cost for prototyping and labour.

o Perspective market and impact.

**ECTE250 Deliverable 1 Proposal Presentation Marking Sheet**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Team Mark** | | | | |
| **Structure:** presentation flow, timing, inclusion of introduction, main body, and conclusion. | **Content:** Was the content relevant? (see below) | **Visual Aids:** Appropriate use of diagrams and illustrations. | **Questions:** Ability to answer questions clearly and concisely by all team members. | **Total marks** |
| **Mark (/5)** | **Mark (/5)** | **Mark (/5)** | **Mark (/5)** | **Mark (/20)** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Comments:** | | | | |
| **Selected Project (aligned with theme and requirements, feasible within allocated time and budget):** | | | | |
| Content Required for Deliverable 1: Minimum 2, maximum 3 project proposals: each should include:  • Description of the project and key functionalities.  • Justification on how the proposed system aligns with the theme.  • Preliminary design (block diagrams, flowcharts, state charts, etc.).  • Justification on how the proposed system aligns with requirements and constraints.  • Estimated prototyping (parts) and labour cost.  • Prospective market and impact. | | | | |
| Marking Guide:  1: Very Poor - Most of the criteria is not met.  2: Poor - While most criteria are met, it is not of a satisfactory standard.  3: Average- All criteria are met to an acceptable level.  4: Good - All criteria are met and the presentation is of a good standard.  5: Very Good - All criteria are met and the presentation is of a very good standard. | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Markers Name:** |  |
| **Team:** |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Individual Marks** | |  |
| **Criteria:** Was the oral delivery fluent, clear and audible? Was the presentation style independent of notes or text on slides? Was the presenter engaged with the audience and were contents presented interestingly? | |
| **Presenter's Name** | **Comments** | **Mark**  **(/10)** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
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